

REMARKS

Applicants have considered the September 19, 2006 Office Action, and the amendments above together with the comments that follow are presented in a bona fide effort to address all issues raised in that Action and thereby place this case in condition for allowance.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 7-10 were pending in this application. In response to the Office Action dated September 19, 2006, claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 8, 9 and 10 have been amended and claim 4 has been cancelled. Applicants submit that the present Amendment does not generate any new matter issue. Adequate descriptive support for the present Amendment should be apparent throughout the originally filed disclosure as, for example, the depicted embodiments and related discussion thereof in the written description of the specification. Entry of the present Amendment is respectfully solicited. It is believed that this response places this case in condition for allowance. Hence, prompt favorable reconsideration of this case is solicited.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 7-10 would be allowed if rewritten to overcome the rejection under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112. Applicants have amended claims 5, 7 and 8 in accordance with the Examiner's helpful suggestions. Applicants have amended claim 1 substantially in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions, differing only in grammatical terms.

Claims 2 and 7-10 have been amended to replace the term "Claim" with "claim" for consistency. Dependent claim 4 has been cancelled since it is believed that subject matter pertaining to the agglomerate and average agglomerate size is recited in independent claim 1, as amended.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 7-10 were rejected under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112, for allegedly omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection in view of the foregoing

claim amendments, which substantially adopt the Examiner's suggestions at page 3 of the Office action. Applicants submit that one having ordinary skill in the art would not have difficulty understanding the scope of the presently claimed subject matter, particularly when reasonably interpreted in light of the supporting specification. Moreover, Applicants submit that the present claims recite all the necessary structural cooperative relationships of elements. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the imposed rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 7-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph is not legally viable and hence, Applicants solicit withdrawal thereof.

It is believed that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Applicants therefore respectfully request an early and favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application. If there are any outstanding issues which might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' representative at the telephone number shown below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Brian K. Seidleck

Registration No. 51,321

600 13<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005-3096  
Phone: 202.756.8000 BKS:ldw  
Facsimile: 202.756.8087  
**Date: December 18, 2006**

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277  
as our correspondence address.**